

promised, and we look forward to action being taken in due course.

I am sure many hon. members frequently visit the Toronto international airport in Mississauga. Originally that airport served a more modest community. However, it has been extended to the point at which it has become a great centre of transportation, a source of noise and smoke pollution. People who live near it are extremely concerned, and justifiably so. The present state of our thinking in this country is to regard the people, their well-being and their way of life as of primary importance, and not what is loosely called progress in a technical sense.

Today, people who live in an area which was relatively unscathed by the disturbance of aircraft taking off and landing find themselves very seriously inconvenienced. Thus, there was great relief among the people of my constituency to hear that the government did not intend to expand this airport further. Instead, another airport is to be built elsewhere in another part of the province. There may, of course, be complaints from residents of the area designated by the plan, and we must maintain an open mind. At the same time, I am dedicated to the proposition that the airport in Mississauga should not be enlarged to the point at which citizens have to deal with flight congestion 24 hours a day.

I should like to say a few words about one of the issues to which reference was made in the Speech from the Throne. I refer to the dangerous situation created by inflation. There is nothing which touches Canadians more drastically than this, and it is heartening that the government is dealing with this problem—

An hon. Member: "Wrestling".

Mr. Abbott: The word wrestling has been used. It might be noted that when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) attempted to introduce some budgetary improvements, it was necessary to wrestle the Tory party to the ground. This proved to be a relatively easy task. Nonetheless, it was a time consuming job though, fortunately, it resulted in a stable government, one of which Canadians can be proud. I was greatly encouraged by the speech of the Minister of Finance.

● (1510)

I was greatly encouraged by the message in the speech of the Minister of Finance. I found it to be realistic, sound, sober, dealing with the problem, not offering any pat or magical solution, and taking note of the great suffering that a number of Canadians are enduring. People talk readily and easily about citizens on fixed incomes being the victims, but too often we pass quickly over this and fail really to consider what is meant by that phrase.

I was reading in the September 28 issue of the *London Economist* a paragraph that perhaps described the problem which in Britain is more severe but which cannot be overlooked as being akin to the problem we face here. The paragraph reads as follows:

Although the society appears more concerned than before to look after the old and the unfortunate, which is only partly a reflection of the improved political strength of the pensioners, much of the older generation's sense of independence is being eaten away. The virtue of thrift is disregarded in the general compulsion to spend, the rewards of such

savings as contributory pensions schemes are being wiped out in the inflation, so that men who retired only three or four years ago with pensions to keep their wives and themselves in modest comfort are now dependent on the charity of their old firms—if those firms are still making profits.

The Minister of Finance has stated what surely any sensible person in this House will recognize if he only reads his daily newspaper, that the fires of inflation are burning everywhere in the world, particularly in the western industrial world; and, if anything, they are burning with less severity in this country than in almost any other country in the western world.

The minister further indicated that this was no matter for comfort or tranquility. He has recognized the problem but said that despite all the world's economists being gathered, under the best possible auspices, no ready solution has been prescribed for treatment.

The President of the United States in his message dealt with the problem in a fashion that I think was responsible. It approached the situation with a number of formulas. Many have already been tried in this country and found to be helpful. He did not indulge in overkill, as the minister stated, and he certainly did not engage in a renewal of the bankrupt policies of wage and price controls which were so favoured by hon. gentlemen opposite.

I have been reading a book called "The Edwardian Era" by Andre Maurois, and one paragraph describing Arthur Balfour could perhaps be applied to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). It need not be added that Mr. Balfour was a very considerable figure in British public life as the Leader of the Opposition is here, and I hope this mildly critical passage has enough complimentary things to say. However, I felt it was curiously apt for the situation that we have seen in the last few months of offering a policy of incomes control to the Canadian people, notwithstanding that it was tried and found to be a failure elsewhere. Perhaps it is not as apt as it seems to me to be, but the paragraph reads as follows:

Like Lord Salisbury, he was frankly conservative because he was gently pessimistic. He considered that a wise man contented himself by a gradual solving of the problems of his generation, with prudence and proportion, and always mindful of his own feeble powers of foresight and of the narrow limits of his field of action. He also believed that there were advantages in doing a stupid thing which had been done before, rather than a wise thing which had never been done. And that is the quintessence of conservatism.

If that is the quintessence of conservatism, I suggest that the Canadian people recognized that spectre and decided that they should return to a strong majority government, and I am proud to be on this side of the House supporting that government.

I am also glad that the Minister of Finance has promised that the government will reduce spending wherever possible, because I believe that government spending in excess is one of the great contributors to inflation. Government spending is not confined to the federal government; the provincial governments of this country have been spending with an open hand, at a rate far exceeding that of the federal government, especially the province of Ontario.

With regard to who is to blame for inflation, government must certainly take its share. Members of the government cannot turn to the business community and assert that they are chiefly responsible for inflation by